REMARKS

Claims 22-42 are pending and stand rejected. In response, Applicant has amended claims 28, 35, and 42.

35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejections

Claims 28, 35, and 42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for being indefinite due to an allegedly unclear use of antecedent basis. In response, Applicant has amended claim 28 to more clearly specify that the plurality of users introduced in claim 28 includes the user introduced in claim 22, that is, "the user" (claim 28, line 3) is directed to "a user" (claim 22, line 3). Claims 35 and 42 have been analogously amended and analogously refer to the user in their corresponding independent claims. Accordingly, amended claims 28, 35, and 42 comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Claims 22-42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, the Examiner is asserting that the following subject matter: "receiving a request from a user to access the resource using a process," "resources available to the process," and "if the accessed data specifies that the resource is available to the process," was not adequately described in the originally filed specification. Applicant respectfully submits the above-cited subject matter was fully described numerous times in the specification as filed, including: (1) "The user is then provided with a platform on which to run programs [e.g., processes] wherein *the user can access the program and have the program access various peripherals* [e.g., one type of resource] through its interaction with the operating system." (Emphasis added), Page 10, paragraph [0015]. (2) "Suppose, alternatively, the user is running EXCEL and wishes to use a spell check resource. Unless that spell check resource, which resides in the WP program, is included in the allowed access rights of the RAT entries [e.g., the accessed data] for the EXCEL program any *user attempt* [e.g., user request] *to access it* [i.e., the spell check resource] *from EXCEL* [i.e.,

6

an example process] will be denied." (Emphasis added), Page 30, paragraph [0050]. (3) "…if the process running on the system has access to that resource, as noted in the resource access table 64 [e.g., the accessed data], the operating system 60 will then grant the resource for use by the process within the operating system." Page 11, paragraph [0018]. Accordingly, independent claims 22, 29, and 36 comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

A description as filed is presumed to be adequate, unless or until sufficient evidence or reasoning to the contrary has been presented by the examiner to rebut the presumption. See, e.g., In re Marzocchi, 439 F.2d 220, 224, 169 USPQ 367, 370 (CCPA 1971). MPEP § 2163.04. In rejecting a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, the Examiner must set forth express findings of fact which support the lack of a written description conclusion. MPEP § 2163.04 I. Given that Applicant has specifically pointed out where the relevant limitations are supported, if the Examiner still maintains that the above limitations do not comply with the written description requirement, Applicant respectfully submits the Examiner is required to establish a *prima facie* case to substantiate such an assertion, specifically by providing reasons why a person skilled in the art at the time the application was filed would not have recognized that the inventor was in possession of the invention as claimed in view of the disclosure of the application as filed. *Id.*

35 U.S.C. § 102(a) Rejections

Claims 22, 23, 28-30, 35-37, and 42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Park et al. (February 2001) (Park hereafter). Independent claims 22, 29, and 36 recite, in substance:

> accessing data associated with the user stored in a memory in response to the received request, the data specifying one or more resources available to the process; and
> providing the process with access to the resource *if the accessed data specifies that the resource is available to the process.*

(emphasis added, quoting from claim 22).

7

Applicant teaches process-based access control, wherein a process is provided with access to a resource if the accessed data specifies that the resource is available to the process. Applicant respectfully submits that Park does not disclose providing the process with access to the resource *if the accessed data specifies that the resource is available to the process,* the data both specifying one or more resources available to the process and being accessed in response to the received request.

In contrast, Park teaches role-based access control wherein access is provided to a resource *if the data specifies that the resource is available to the role of the user.* "7. Display appropriate resources *after authorization check based on client's roles."* Park, page 65, Fig. 18 (emphasis added). Park's "Role-Based Access Control on the Web" article is wholly concerned with role-based access control, the basis of which is explained as follows: "Its [role-based access control's] basic notion is that permissions are associated with roles, and users are assigned to appropriate roles." Park, page 39, Section 2. Park handles access control *through roles of users,* so access is provided to a resource *if the data specifies that the resource is available to the role of the user; not if the accessed data specifies that the resource is available to the process.*

Accordingly, given Park fails to teach at least one limitation of claims 22, 29, and 36, these claims are patentable over Park. Claims 23, 28, 30, 35, 37, and 42 depend from claim 22, 29, or 36, either directly or via intervening claims. Therefore, for at least the same reasons above, claims 23, 28, 30, 35, 37, and 42 are also patentable over Park.

Further, while Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims 23, 28, 30, 35, 37, and 42 are patentable over Park based on their respective independent claims, these dependent claims are also patentable over Park based on their respective additional novel recitations. For example, claim 23 specifically recites "wherein the data stored in the memory comprises a process resource access table for the process and associated with the user, the

8

process resource access table specifying an access right of the process to the resource." The Examiner rejected claim 23 based on Park, page 64, lines 1-8, which discusses a table that "is referenced to check if the user has proper roles to access particular resources...." Park, page 64, lines 6-7. Applicant respectfully submits that such a table in no way anticipates a process resource access table which specifies an access right of a *process* to a resource. Park does not anticipate this additional limitation of claim 23 for not the least of which reason Park teaches *a role-based access control system, and not Applicant's process-based security system.*

35 U.S.C. § 102(b) Rejections

Claims 22, 23, 28-30, 35-37, and 42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Park. As fully discussed above, Park does not anticipate claims 22, 23, 28-30, 35-37, and 42 because Park fails to teach at least one limitation of independent claims 22, 29, and 36. Additionally, the Examiner asserts that the parent application (10/061,701) does not provide a written basis for the new claims. Applicant respectfully submits the parent application does provide such a basis because the same supporting disclosure cited in the application at issue is also disclosed in the parent application. Accordingly, Park is unavailable as 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) prior art.

35 U.S.C. § 102(e) Rejections

Claims 22-24, 27, 29-31, 34, 36-38, and 41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Trabelsi et al. (US 2001/0056494) (Trabelsi hereafter). Independent claims 22, 29, and 36 recite, in substance:

> accessing data associated with the user stored in a memory in response to the received request, the data specifying one or more resources available to the process; and
> providing the process with access to the resource *if the accessed data specifies that the resource is available to the process.*

(emphasis added, quoting from claim 22).

· 9

Applicant respectfully submits that Trabelsi does not disclose providing the process with access to the resource *if the accessed data specifies that the resource is available to the process,* the data both specifying one or more resources available to the process and being accessed in response to the received request. In contrast, Trabelsi teaches role-based access control wherein access is provided to a resource *if the data specifies that the resource is available to the role of the user.* "A validity domain defines a part of a set of resources 2d that is accessible for a given role." Trabelsi, page 3, paragraph [0046]. Trabelsi handles access control *through roles of users,* so access is provided to a resource *if the data specifies that the resource is available to the role of the user;* *not* if the accessed data specifies that the resource is available to the process.

Accordingly, given Trabelsi fails to teach at least one limitation of claims 22, 29, and 36, these claims are patentable over Trabelsi. Claims 23-24, 27, 30-31, 34, 37-38, and 41 depend from claim 22, 29, or 36, either directly or via intervening claims. Therefore, for at least the same reasons above, claims 23-24, 27, 30-31, 34, 37-38, and 41 are also patentable over Trabelsi.

Additionally, the Examiner addressed claims 25-26, 32-33, and 39-40 only with regard to 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Applicant thus understands that if the Examiner were to withdraw the new matter rejection, claims 25-26, 32-33, and 39-40 would be deemed allowable subject matter by virtue of the new matter rejection withdrawal alone.

10

For the above reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that the claimed invention is allowable over the art of record, and requests that the claims be allowed. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone in order to advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

VINCENT ALAN LARSEN

Dated: May 9, 2006   By: _____

Pierre Keeley, Reg. No. 57,045
Attorney for Applicant
Fenwick & West LLP
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Tel.: (650) 335-7242
Fax: (650) 938-5200

11